

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 6, 10, 16 and 21 are independent. No amendments to the claims have been made. Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

I. SPECIFICATION

As requested by the Examiner, Applicants have amended the title of the application and respectfully submits that the above title is descriptive of the invention and requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the title.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,491,749 issued to Rogaway (hereinafter "Rogaway"). The rejection is respectfully traversed in its entirety. Claims 6-14 and 16-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,204,902 issued to Reeds, III (hereinafter "Reeds"). The rejection is respectfully traversed in its entirety.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the reference must teach every element of the claim and "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." (see MPEP §2131).

Rogaway discloses generation of a short session key by communication partners based on Diffie-Hellman key exchange model.. Particularly, in two communication flows, communication partners exchange two textual portions and two flows which together define the short lived session key. The short lived session key is then used in a third communication flow by one communication partner to authenticate herself to the

other communication partner. (See Rogaway col. 5, line 66 to col. 8 and col. 8, lines 20-45).

Rogaway does not disclose or even suggest generating a plurality of keys in response to a received challenge as in independent claim 1. Since Rogaway does not teach every element of claim 1, Applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 for at least the foregoing reasons.

Reeds discloses a typical mobile unit for which a service provider assigns a phone number (MIN1), an area code (MIN2) and a secret key (A-key). An electronic serial number (ESN) that is unique to the unit is also installed in the unit by manufacturer. The ESN, MIN1, MIN2 and A-key are to be used for authentication of the mobile unit. (See Reeds, col. 4, lines 27-36 and lines 47-55, and col. 6, lines 3-35).

Reeds does not disclose or even suggest a subscriber identification module comprising a key generation element and a signature generator configured to receive a secret key from the key generation element as in independent claim 6.

Reeds also does not disclose a key generator for generating a plurality of keys and a signature generator as in independent claim 10.

Similarly, Reeds does not disclose generating a plurality of keys and transmitting at least one key from the plurality of keys to a communication device communicatively coupled to a subscriber identification device as in independent claims 16 and 21. More particularly, Reeds does not disclose assigning a weight as in claim 21.

Since Reeds does not teach every element of claims 6, 10, 16 and 21, Applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 for at least the foregoing reasons.

Also, Applicant submits that claims 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11-14 and 17-19 are allowable based on their dependency from an allowable base claim as well as other novel features included therein.

III. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Rogaway in view of Applied Cryptography (hereinafter Schneier). The Examiner also rejected claims 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Reeds in view of Schneier.

Claims 3, 15 and 20 depend from and include all the elements cited in the independent claims 1, 10 and 16, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are believed to be allowable based on their dependency from an allowable base claim as well as other novel features included therein.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 23, 2004

By: Jae-Hee Choi
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,288

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 651-1179
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502